

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Can We Strengthen the Canadian - U. S. Partnership?

Moderator, WILLIAM TRAUM

S p e a k e r s

LIONEL FORSYTH

RICHARD BOWDITCH

—COMING—

—March 17, 1953—

**Should Tidelands Oil Be Returned
to the States?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 41



\$5.50 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 18

No. 41



How Can We Strengthen the Canadian - U. S. Partnership?

The Broadcast of March 3, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 p. m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from Windsor Hall in the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, Canada, under the auspices of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, La Chambre de Commerce de Montreal, and the Montreal Board of Trade.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

LIONEL A. FORSYTH, Q.C.—President of Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, Montreal, and subsidiary companies; Chairman of the Legislation Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Forsyth was born in Mont Denson, Nova Scotia, and received his early education at Kings College School, Windsor, N.S., where he afterwards became a teacher. During this early period in his life he made several trips to England, South Africa, and elsewhere on his father's sailing ship. Mr. Forsyth later came to the United States for post-graduate work at Harvard University, went on to teach school in Concord, Massachusetts, and then became Professor of Romance languages at Trinity College, Durham, North Carolina. Following this, he tried the banking business, and for a time held positions with the Bank of Nova Scotia in Toronto and Havana. Then, at the request of his old college, he again took up teaching at the University of King's College. During this period he began the study of law and was admitted to the bar of Nova Scotia. He practiced law in Halifax for eight years and then moved to Montreal, where he was also admitted to the bar. In 1949 Mr. Forsyth was appointed Executive Vice President of the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation; he was named President the following year.

RICHARD L. BOWDITCH — President of C. H. Sprague and Son, Boston. Mr. Bowditch not only is President and Director of the C. H. Sprague and Son Company in Boston, Massachusetts, but holds the same title in the coal concern's Canadian operation. He is also President of the Sprague Steamship Company. His many directorships further indicate an active role in the business field; they include the Boston & Maine Railroad, United States Chamber of Commerce, First National Bank of Boston, Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, Ludlow Manufacturing Associates, The New River Company, Pacific Mills, Sylvania Electric Products, American Research and Development Company, and the Transportation Association of America. He is co-chairman of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce's Canada-U. S. Committee. On the New England Council he is chairman of the Canadian Relations Committee. A native of Massachusetts, Mr. Bowditch is a trustee and member of the Corporation of Boston's Northeastern University.

(Continued on page 15)

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year. (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1953, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

How Can We Strengthen the Canadian - U. S. Partnership?

Announcer:

We greet you tonight from Montreal, Quebec, the commercial and financial capital of Canada. On this day of the opening of Town Hall's Canadian education course, Town Meeting salutes its neighbor to the north. We are broadcasting from Windsor Hall in the historic Windsor Hotel and we are the guests of three organizations, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, La Chambre de Commerce du District de Montreal, and the Montreal Board of Trade. Their officers and members send greetings to their many friends in the United States. Situated on the St. Lawrence River, Montreal offers the curious spectacle of a modern commercial capital growing around an old-world city.

It was in Montreal that the discoverers of the continent made their home. The view from Mount Royal overlooking this great city of more than one million residents is known to tourists from all over the world. Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion, here is William Traum, director of radio and television for Town Hall, substituting tonight for Gunnar Back.

Mr. Traum:

We are happy indeed to originate this Town Meeting tonight from Montreal on the very day of the opening at Town Hall in New York of a special series of meetings for business executives on the theme: "Canada, Nation on the March." Under the joint auspices of leading industrial and business executives of the United States and Canada, the purpose of the meetings is to foster a better under-

standing of mutual problems. The Town Hall series was inaugurated this afternoon by the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, who is, of course, Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs and President of the seventh session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. He also kindly accepted our invitation to transcribe a statement setting the stage for our discussion tonight in beautiful Windsor Hall at the Windsor Hotel in Montreal. The Honorable Lester B. Pearson.

Hon. Pearson:

Town Hall meetings held across Canada and the United States in an earlier and more tranquil day were the cradle of our democracy. Freedom of discussion and debate, the honest exchange of conflicting ideas and argument—these things which we cherish were born of such meetings. The democratic community has now vastly increased in size and complexity. The importance of freedom of thought and discussion is for this reason greater than ever before. Therefore I welcome the chance to give this brief word of introduction before your Town Meeting of the Air begins tonight.

This meeting links the peoples of our two countries in a huge assembly. Only a handful will see the speakers face to face and not all of us will have the opportunity of firing questions at them. But many hundreds of thousands will be listening, and the topic we have chosen, "How Can We Strengthen the Canadian-U.S. Partnership?" is one which is worthy, I think, of their interest and one to which no one should be indifferent. No two

countries are more closely concerned with each other's affairs than Canada and its good friend and neighbor, the United States.

In some parts of the world, where smaller countries lie next to more powerful neighbors, the dominant keynote is fear and subordination; in North America, it is friendship and confidence founded on a free partnership. Proximity which arises from the facts of politics and geography can often breed fear. In the case of our two peoples, it has bred deep and abiding mutual respect. Proximity does not mean for us the imposed leadership of the despot or the enforced obedience of the reluctant satellite. It means in our case a partnership based on consultation and co-operation, and includes the right to agree or to disagree.

This tradition of the good neighbor derives not merely from the fact that we are joint occupants of a common continent endowed with great material resources that have been developed by the industry and spirit of Canadians and Americans, nor is it due only to the fact that we know and act upon the knowledge that our defense knows no national boundaries, that it lies in collective measures shared with our neighbors and our friends and in the pledges we have made—and which we are honoring—as members of the United Nations.

The sources of this tradition lie deeper than that. They are found in the faith which illuminates our search for the welfare and security of our own peoples and of others as well. Respect for freedom, for the rights of individual men and women, are the principal and lasting assets in this Canadian-American partnership. In your discussion tonight of measures to

strengthen the well-being and security of our two countries, I am sure it will not be forgotten that their ultimate purpose is to strengthen the freedom of our peoples and, indeed, of all peoples of the free world.

In the days ahead, this partnership will face problems of great difficulty, and we will no doubt have our arguments about how best to deal with them, but there will be no argument about the fact that in this restless and changing world our best hope for the future lies in maintaining and strengthening this partnership as part of the great coalition of all free peoples. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Secretary Pearson, for giving us this keynote to our exploration of ideas for the strengthening of the Canadian-United States partnership. Now with us tonight in Montreal are two leading industrialists of our two countries, Lionel A. Forsyth, President of the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation of Canada, who is an attorney and a former college professor. He knows the United States well from his studies at Harvard and his teaching at Trinity College in North Carolina. Our American spokesman, Mr. Richard L. Bowditch, not only is president of C. H. Sprague and Son in Boston but also holds the same title in his company's Canadian operations. He is also president of the Sprague Steamship Company. Both men are active in the National Chambers of Commerce of their respective countries. So let's hear first from Mr. Lionel A. Forsyth.

Mr. Forsyth:

When this question, "How Can the Canadian-United States Partnership Be Strengthened?" was

first proposed to me as a subject for discussion, it immediately raised another question, and that question is; "What Is the Canadian-United States Partnership?" And for the purpose of my approach to it, I define it thus: It is the association, unplanned, perhaps even unconscious, of the collective populations of these two North American nations, in the common purpose of world leadership toward spiritual and perhaps material goals, the attainment of which today's competitive ideologies obstruct.

The most important assets of the partnership as such are ideas and ideals. Each nation possesses and practices the same essential freedoms. Each has a government which responds to and activates the will of its people. Each has comparable standards of enlightenment and letters, of opportunity for its citizens. Each partner preserves the right to regulate its own affairs and affirm and maintain such political and other alliances as it considers advisable and convenient. That partnership should be strong and must be strengthened if its objectives are to be achieved.

In my view, those things which can be done to strengthen this association fall into two groups: namely, those things which will increase its stature in the eyes of those whom we wish to lead along the paths of peace and plenty, and which in the main arise in our relations with other peoples, and those things which require improvement in our relations with each other. In the first group, I list as most important the necessity that our motives be understood and respected by those whom we wish to lead.

To that end we should, first,

abandon the self-righteous habit of thought and action which too often accompanies great wealth such as our countries possess. Second, convince a tormented and war-torn world that absence of fortifications and military establishments on our boundaries for over a century is not a mere accident of circumstance, but the deliberate expression of the will of two peaceful peoples. Third, by precept and example, both as individuals and collectively, make it clear beyond question that aggression and conquest, whether military or economic, have no place in our philosophy. As between ourselves, we must continually strive toward a more complete, mutual understanding of each other.

To attain it, we should, first, get to know each other better, for no partnership can prosper where the partners are total strangers. Second, respect each other's points of view. Speaking as a Canadian, I must admit that your country is more populous and more wealthy, but I cannot agree that for that reason I must condition my thinking or conform in my actions to standards set by the United States. Third, eliminate from our relations with each other any suggestion of arrogance and intolerance. I am a Canadian, and proud of that fact. You have an equal right to be proud of your citizenship in the United States, but there still remains a modicum of truth in the saying, "Comparisons are odious."

Fourth, plan a campaign for better mutual knowledge of our respective countries and their problems. Fifth, modify and correct tariffs which unreasonably impede the exchange of commodities between our countries and repeal regulations which impose irritat-

ing and unnecessary restrictions upon trade. (*Applause*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. Now, Mr. Bowditch, speaking as an American businessman, may we have your thoughts on strengthening the partnership of Canada and the United States?

Mr. Bowditch:

There is little basic difference in the official policies of Canada and the United States to give concern. There are sometimes different views on details of implementation. If we would strengthen the partnership of Canada and the United States, we must address ourselves to the people of the two countries. Brighter elements of good international relations are mutual respect, trust, and understanding. The relationship between Canada and the United States exemplifies the greatest international community of interest in the world today and provides the best opportunity to demonstrate international good will. Demanded by common interest and realized by common effort, it stands as an example worthy of emulation in the world community.

This respect and understanding must be based on knowledge, and knowledge is not spread simply by spreading facts. The facts must be presented in meaningful terms, not discounting lightly the emotional aspect of the problem. Both Canada and the United States face the task of portraying their respective countries and economies accurately and effectively across the border. In the United States, there are many areas of ignorance about Canada and its economy. And where there is ignorance, there is confusion and misconception. Canadians, I believe, generally know

more about the United States, but still many misconceptions remain to be dispelled. Understanding, based on the knowledge of facts about the people and their economy, can do much to rectify this situation.

A thorough-going knowledge of the peoples of Canada and the United States is essential for the proper development of both countries in the future. I know that the Canadian Chamber of Commerce has initiated a program with this thought in mind through the local chambers in Canada. Furthermore, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, through the Canada-United States Committee, have made extensive surveys of the problem areas and are currently engaged in determining and applying appropriate solutions.

I am hopeful for the future. Hard work and patience in educating the human side of the problem, as well as knowledge of the economies and the proper integration of the same, will go hand-in-hand toward making a healthy situation for the two nations, without jeopardizing in any way the political sovereignty of our respective countries. Let us agree that the resources of this continent must be developed intelligently for all of us in both nations, and let us affirm our belief that this can best be done through friendship, understanding, and mutual co-operation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you very much, Mr. Bowditch. Now gentlemen, before we turn to our interrogators, perhaps you would like to comment on each other's statements. Let's hear now from Mr. Forsyth.

Mr. Forsyth: Perhaps the best thing that I can say about Mr.

Bowditch's statement is that his statement and mine seem to fit pretty well together, and perhaps the two of us give a pretty fair example of what the United States-Canadian partnership means. One thing I must say about his statement, and it's a criticism of my own as well, is that we both stuck pretty well to generalities and we didn't go into the particular at all.

Mr. Traum: All right, Mr. Bowditch, please.

Mr. Bowditch: I like the statement made by Mr. Forsyth. I think it pointed up the question of the evening extraordinarily well. I'm glad he came first in the program, because, as he said, generalities seem to be the order of the day, and I might say that mine was a fill in.

Mr. Traum: All right, gentlemen, now if we can get down to the serious again. No discussion of Canadian-American relations, of course, would be complete without some reference to the St. Lawrence Seaway project. Mr. Bowditch, while you are here, why do you think opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway in the United States has been so pronounced in some quarters?

Mr. Bowditch: That's quite a question, Mr. Traum. Of course, we look at the St. Lawrence waterway through a number of different eyes. We probably have three or four very definite areas in our country which you might say even in our own country don't understand as much about one another as they should. Take the man from Texas. He doesn't understand really, and in some cases probably doesn't care too much, about the St. Lawrence waterway. It seems a long way off. It seems distant to him. He can't visualize it.

Now, another thing, the ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the railroads serving them think, well here is a waterway which is open, we'll say for eight months in the year. Stand-by facilities to handle the traffic coming in and out of the country, or to the central part of the country, must be maintained by a single economy throughout the entire year, and so I suppose they think there is a duplication of effort in this situation. Now, I don't know if that answers your question entirely, but there are two facts.

Mr. Traum: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bowditch. We'd like to hear from Mr. Forsyth, on this same question. Mr. Forsyth, what is your reaction as a Canadian to American opposition to the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. Forsyth: As a Canadian, my reaction to the attitude of the United States is, I think, crudely and shortly stated, that that's their business. So far as we in Canada are concerned, we have an appreciation of this project in which we do not discount the great importance of the power that will be derived from the Seaway as such, and it is our belief in Canada that that power should be made available to the economy of both countries as rapidly as possible. We must respect the views of our neighbors on the subject, but in the meantime we reserve our right to proceed as we think best. (*Applause*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. Now, Mr. Bowditch has a comment.

Mr. Bowditch: I think pretty much everybody would agree with Mr. Forsyth about the power. As I look at this situation, there are

two distinct parts—the power and the Seaway. Whether one can be built without the other, I am not enough of a student of the subject to answer intelligently, but I believe, as Mr. Forsyth does, that the power should come and it should come fast. I think it will come. I think it's just a question of getting the proper persons in our country to O.K. a go ahead to the state of New York for our participation in the project.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Bowditch. The St. Lawrence Seaway, I believe, is another program. Perhaps we can devote an entire Town Meeting to it at a later date. Now every week on Town Meeting we use a question which has been submitted in advance by one of our listeners, and to encourage your participation we send a twenty-volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia to the listener whose question is selected. An immigration officer, Mr. Joseph E. Dupuis of Salinas, California, says this particular question is constantly asked him by Canadian visitors and this, gentlemen, is the question: "Would Canadian-United States relations be strengthened by removing immigration document requirements and permitting free border crossings by nationals of the two countries?" Mr. Forsyth, as our Canadian speaker, what do you think about it?

Mr. Forsyth: I think that the question must be answered in the affirmative. These countries that lie side by side require that the citizens of each should pass to and fro freely, and one of the ways that we are going to get to know each other better is to start to appreciate each other at the border. I think that Mr. Dupuis' question should be answered in the affirmative and that immediate steps

should be taken to minimize the irritation of such regulations as exist.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. Do you agree, Mr. Bowditch?

Mr. Bowditch: I do agree.

Mr. Traum: Fine. Thank you very much. Now if you will broaden out a bit on the statements which you have presented, we are going to call now on three newsmen who have distinguished themselves in reporting the Canadian scene. Mr. Georges Langlois is a native of Quebec Province. He is the author of Parliamentary Correspondence for the newspaper *La Presse* which is published in Montreal. Blair Fraser, also a Canadian, is the author-editor of *Maclean's* magazine, and James R. Conant, the son of Dr. James Bryant Conant, came to Canada in 1950 and is chief of the Montreal Bureau for *Time* and *Life* magazines. Now, Mr. Langlois, will you direct the first question, please?

Mr. Langlois: In his opening statement, Mr. Forsyth said that the association of Canada and the United States was unplanned and perhaps even unconscious. Now this gathering tonight would make it appear that it's getting at least conscious, to some extent. I would like him to tell us to what extent this association is unplanned and unconscious and to what extent it is deliberate and could be better planned.

Mr. Forsyth: To the extent to which it is unplanned, I think I can best answer this: probably there is a plan behind it all, but it is a Divine plan and I thought we were speaking about mortal matters here. (*Applause.*) And so far as its being unconscious is concerned, I would like Mr. Langlois

to remember, as I know he does, that here before us we have the elite of the population of the City of Montreal, and they're not unconscious about anything. But I find it difficult to believe that there aren't people in the United States, for instance, who would be surprised to find me here without a scalping knife at my belt. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth, and we'd like to present our second interrogator, Mr. Blair Fraser. Mr. Fraser, your question?

Mr. Fraser: Well, this question could go to either of the two speakers, but Mr. Forsyth, again, is the one who mentioned it in his statement. He made a reference to the removal of trade barriers. Both our countries, as both speakers know, are rather fond of lecturing European countries on this subject and encouraging them and exhorting them to form a European community, an integrated community. I'd like your opinion on why it is that Canada and the United States haven't been able to form a North American community and get rid of our own trade barriers.

Mr. Forsyth: Well, there are two answers to that, I think, Mr. Fraser. One is the immortal reply—bureaucratic inertia. The other one is, that there is a certain amount of human selfishness in this partnership, even though I spoke of it in such highly spiritual terms.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. Now, Mr. Bowditch has a comment.

Mr. Bowditch: After that, I think any comment from me would be superfluous. But I think Mr. Forsyth has it right. I think we should do everything we can in both of our countries to tear down

these barriers of which you speak, simplify everything as far as we can, and do it as fast as possible. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Bowditch. Let's have a question now from Mr. James R. Conant.

Mr. Conant: Mr. Forsyth, you referred just now to the surprise, perhaps, of some of the audience because they didn't hear any war whoops emitted, and at the same time in your opening statement you indicated that you felt that as a Canadian you shouldn't be required to conform to attitudes of the United States. I wonder if you feel that there is a distinctly Canadian way of life as opposed to the so-called American way of life, and if you could try and sum that up for us. That's a big question.

Mr. Forsyth: I feel that there is a Canadian way of life. I also feel that it is a big question. (*Laughter.*) But I think one might say this: that here in Canada, speaking in a general way, we have the descendants of two cultures, who have settled this country, have muddled along wherever it has gone, and we haven't done it without undergoing some influence from the United States. The tremendous inflow of American periodicals, the moving pictures that we see in our theaters, the television that we see in some places—all these things carry with them American influences.

But I still like to think that there is in Canada a definite Canadian way of life and a Canadian way of thought. I like to think that we in this new country have preserved those things that were best in the lives that lay behind the settlers in this country, that we will continue to preserve those things, to develop them, and fit them to this country. And I like to think, also,

that what there is good in the United States, and there is a great deal of good there, that we appropriate it to ourselves as fast as can. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. We're going to continue our discussion with a question from Mr. Georges Langlois.

Mr. Langlois: All the questions up to now have been mostly shot at Mr. Forsyth. I'd like to put Mr. Bowditch on the grill now. Since the Korean War and the Atlantic Pact, there has been a lot of talk about standardization of armaments. We Canadians have been saying that we are quite willing and ready to accept either the British or the U.S. standards if those two countries could get together and set one standard for the three countries. What comment can you offer on this, Mr. Bowditch?

Mr. Bowditch: Not being a military man in the sense of having any great knowledge of the subject at hand, I would think that it would be of very great use to standardize all of the weapons between the three countries, and I think Canada is in a unique position to interpret the thinking of the United States to Great Britain and vice-versa and to help in such a move. That's my own personal sentiment on the question.

Mr. Langlois: As you say, Canada has tried to get Congress together, and some talks have been taking place on this matter. Do you think any progress has been made?

Mr. Bowditch: I don't feel competent to say that, sir, because I am not close enough to the military situation.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Bowditch and Mr. Langlois. And now a question from Blair Fraser.

Mr. Fraser: This is also for Mr. Bowditch. You may have found out already after a brief stay here that a Canadian's favorite indoor sport is telling visiting Americans how Americans annoy us. Would you take this opportunity to tell us how Canadians annoy you? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Bowditch: Well, personally, I've found very few Canadians that annoy me. In fact, if you asked me to name any, I'd find it very difficult. There's been a survey made with that thought in mind. It's a two-way street, and what I said earlier, that Canadians probably know more about the states than people on our side of the line know about Canadians, I think is so, but we get a lot of curious thinking. In a recent survey this came up from a Canadian. Canada shouldn't buy so much from the United States; United States goods are inferior to European goods in workmanship; you can't believe United States labels or claims for a product.

Another thing, although American companies pay very high wages to their United States employees, they underpay their Canadian employees. Another thing, Americans are all noisy, bossy people, ignorant of the true cultural matters and are only interested in the dollar. And then it says, look at their love of new gadgets. So you see, isn't irritation both ways? But I think it's not insurmountable, we can work it out. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Bowditch. Mr. Conant, may we have another question from you?

Mr. Conant: I would like to make this one to Mr. Forsyth if I could. We've read a lot in the papers and magazines about Canada's importance to the U.S. as a

supplier of raw materials, starting with newsprint, going through oil, iron, and a host of other minerals and perhaps ending up with uranium, the most important of all in the future. Do you feel that this is likely to continue or do you think there might be an attitude in Canada such as some other countries have taken with raw materials—that you cut off the supply of raw materials to the U.S. and keep them for Canadian consumption?

Mr. Forsyth: I think that it is not likely to occur at any very early date. I believe that when the Canadian economy requires that Canadian raw materials be processed in Canada then economic commands or demands will require that that be done.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Forsyth. Mr. Bowditch has a comment on that.

Mr. Bowditch: I think again that that probably is a two-way street. We like to look at your oil in the West; you, like to look at our coal, in Ontario. Sulphur comes from the United States; citrus fruits come from the United States, and I sort of have the feeling that this partnership, as it develops, is going to develop not out of necessity, the way partnerships are developing in Europe, but out of expediency—what's best for all of us.

Mr. Traum: Thank you, very much, Mr. Bowditch. While you're here, we're going to our audience now for questions.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Questioner: Mr. Bowditch, in your opinion, is there any likelihood that the new administration in your country will move toward a reduction in tariffs and an increase in quotas which would make it easier for Canadian goods, as well as the goods of other countries to enter your great market?

Mr. Bowditch: I think it's a little early yet to say what the administration will do, but I have never seen before so much talk about doing just that thing as there is at the present time. So where there's smoke, there must be some fire.

Questioner: Mr. Forsyth, in what respects can we hope for further implementation of the Hyde Park agreement?

Mr. Forsyth: Well, I can't say that we can hope for a further implementation in any respects, so far as I know, but I believe that

the United States is an honorable country, and I believe that it will live up to one of the engagements it has entered into, and certainly Canada can and will do no less.

Questioner: What is the reaction of Americans to the French and English cultures of Canada and the influence they exert on our way of life?

Mr. Bowditch: The influence of French Canadian culture on Canadian way of life? Our reaction to it is that it is an extremely interesting situation — one that we probably don't know too much about. I think those of us in New England, where we have French from Canada as well as English from Canada, we know a little more about it than the rest of the country, but that's one of those things about which Mr. Forsyth and I have been talking, that we must educate our people, because

there is no generalization that I can give you in answer to that question.

Questioner: Mr. Forsyth, do you think that the average Canadian opposes the idea of economic union between the U. S. and Canada?

Mr. Forsyth: I think that the average Canadian wants to remain a Canadian economically and every other way.

Questioner: A question for Mr. Bowditch. We feel sensitive here about the way U. S. newspapers and films misrepresent facts about Canada. Can you suggest how this might be improved?

Mr. Bowditch: I think through education again, and I might make one little statement. The question is, what form of education is the best? I remember we discussed this in the United States-Canada Committee. How can we best portray one country to the people of the other country and then how could we portray the thoughts of the Canadian Chamber to the American Chamber?

At first it was thought that we would send two people from the American Chamber to talk at a directors' meeting of the Canadian Chamber and vice-versa until somebody came up with the bright idea and said, why don't you put them together in a joint meeting—the whole bunch of them? You'll get further that way. So all I can say is, come over and see us, keep talking to us, and maybe things will straighten out a little bit more.

Questioner: Mr. Forsyth, don't you feel that we Canadians have a slight national inferiority complex and because of this we are apt to resent the United States, somewhat?

Mr. Forsyth: That may be true

collectively. (*Laughter.*) But personally, I can only use the words of the old song, *I Never Feel That Way.* (*Applause.*)

Questioner: Mr. Bowditch, you and Mr. Forsyth seem to agree on immigration, but is it realized what harm the McCarran Act has done to friendly U. S.-Canadian relations—namely, by preventing students and the like from re-entering the United States?

Mr. Bowditch: No, I don't think that is fully realized as yet. I think that it will be brought up in the Congress for discussion without any doubt—at least, that's my personal opinion—sometime in the not too distant future, and I think you should register that and make yourselves heard, because I think one of the ways of carrying on education is to get more Canadian students over on our side of the line and vice-versa. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Traum: Thank you, Mr. Bowditch. Gentlemen, I am very sorry we haven't more time for questions from our guest interrogators and from this fine Montreal audience. Thanks to you, Mr. Forsyth and Mr. Bowditch, for your interesting discussion. Thanks to you, Mr. Conant, Mr. Langlois, and Mr. Fraser, for your questions. Sorry we didn't have time for more of them. For Town Hall, we express our appreciation to the officers and the members of the three organizations which made this broadcast of Town Meeting possible, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, La Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, and the Montreal Board of Trade. Our particular appreciation to Mr. W. John Sheridan, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Thanks also to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. In what fields has Canadian-U.S. cooperation been most successful?
least successful?
 - coordination of military defense
 - eliminating economic barriers
 - consulting on foreign policy
 - settling problems caused by our joint boundary
 - others
2. To what extent has our World War II experience facilitated joint defense planning?
 - a. Is the Permanent Joint Board of Defense, created in 1940, giving us maximum coordination of our military efforts?
 - b. How far have the following cooperative projects progressed?
 - standardization of weapons
 - coordination of research
 - exchange of officers for military training
 - agreement on use of strategic materials
 - coordination of radar screens
 - cooperation in NATO
3. Is it imperative that Canada and the U.S. be considered as one, inseparable, geographic entity in any defense plan to protect the North American continent?
4. Is our mutual dependence in matters of defense fully appreciated on both sides of the border—both by the responsible officials and the populations at large?
5. To what extent are Canada and the U.S. economically dependent on one another?
 - a. Which products and markets are directly or indirectly involved in this dependence?
 - b. Are Canadians justified in fearing increasing U. S. protectionism?
e.g. recent dairy import restrictions.
 - c. Is fear of trade restrictions the sole motive of those Canadians who discourage their country's dependence on the U. S. market?
Or, does the traditional tie to the Commonwealth influence the desire to divert more Canadian trade into the sterling area?
 - d. Do American legislators fully appreciate the effects of their trade policy on their Canadian neighbors?
 - e. Is it true that the U.S. is slowly becoming a "have-not" nation in strategic raw materials? If so, is its increasing dependence on Canada's vast mineral wealth fully understood by responsible policy-makers?
 - f. What is the extent of U.S. investment in Canadian industrial development? Is the average American aware of his stake in Canada's economic future?

6. How extensive is the reputed exodus of college graduates and executives from Canada to big jobs in the U.S.?
 - a. What effect has this movement had on Canada's critical shortage of manpower?
 - b. Is there any constructive, cooperative effort that can be made to alleviate this problem?
7. Can the U.S. and Canada honestly advocate a policy of economic integration in Western Europe without giving serious consideration to a similar policy on their own continent?
8. What are the arguments pro and con concerning the long-delayed St. Lawrence Seaway Plan?
 - a. Are Canadians justified in planning to build the Seaway alone, considering the unwillingness of Congress to support this project?
 - b. Has the Eisenhower election affected the likelihood of U.S. participation in this project in the near future?
 - c. Has the sustained world crisis increased the need for a St. Lawrence Seaway? Is it a vital necessity to North American defense plans?
9. Can and should Canada and the U.S. further coordinate their foreign policies?
 - a. Is there any international problem affecting one that does not affect the other?
 - b. In 1951, Secretary for External Affairs, Pearson, stated that "easy and automatic" relations between Canada and the U.S. were a thing of the past. Do you agree?
 - c. Has the U.S. considered Canada as merely an echo of its own voice in foreign affairs?
 - d. Has the U.S. seriously considered Canadian suggestions and criticisms regarding policies affecting war and peace?
 - e. Has Canada's unique position as an economically strong, politically independent power, which neither embarrasses nor scares more dependent nations, been recognized by the United States—especially in regard to United Nations activities?
 - f. Has Canada's unique position between Britain and the U.S. been fully appreciated and utilized in building a strong North Atlantic community?
10. Is it true that today Canada is going through a period of increasing self-consciousness, growing nationalism, and reevaluation of its own strength and potential?
 - a. If so, what does this mean in terms of future U.S.-Canadian relations?
 - b. Must the U.S. demonstrate increasing recognition and consideration of the Canadian "point of view"?
11. Is there any justification for the assertion of the Massey Report that Canadian "use of American institutions . . . even abject imitation of them has caused an uncritical acceptance of ideas and assumptions which are alien to our (Canadian) traditions"?

- a. What are the major cultural, historical and social similarities and differences between Canadians and Americans?
 - b. Has constant exposure to American magazines, movies, radio and television programs adversely affected Canadians?
 - c. How can a more genuine, two-way cultural interchange be encouraged?
12. Should Americans and Canadians be concerned about each other's domestic politics?
- a. Can the Republican victory in the U.S. affect the outcome of the Canadian elections? Does it possibly indicate a conservative trend?
 - b. What effect can the recent 11% income tax reduction in Canada have upon U.S. tax policy deliberations?

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

(Continued from page 2)

BLAIR FRASER (Interrogator)—Correspondent for *Maclean's* magazine in Ottawa. As *Maclean's* Ottawa Editor, Blair Fraser has become one of the magazine's most steady producers of major articles. On the international front in recent years he has covered the San Francisco Conference, the Paris Peace Conference, and the United Nations in New York; and within the last two years he has visited India, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, China, England, Norway, Sweden, Iran and Yugoslavia. He keeps readers posted on the latest in Canadian politics in his *Backstage at Ottawa* feature in each issue of *Maclean's*. Blair Fraser is a Maritimer, born in Sydney, Cape Breton, and is a graduate of Acadia University at Wolfville, N.S. He first became a newspaperman with the *Montreal Herald*, switched to the *Montreal Star*, and eventually to the *Gazette*, where he became associate editor. At the end of 1943 he resigned to become *Maclean's* Ottawa Editor. As a sideline to this he has become one of the country's best-known radio political commentators.

JAMES R. CONANT (Interrogator)—Chief of the Montreal Bureau of *Time* and *Life*. James Richard Conant, one of four staff correspondents covering Canada for *Time* and *Life*, he has served as Chief of the Montreal Bureau since July 1950. Mr. Conant was born in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on May 17, 1923. He attended Phillips Exeter Academy and the University of Michigan. Following his graduation in 1943, he entered the United States Navy, serving on five submarine war patrols. Mr. Conant began his journalistic career in 1946 as a staff reporter on the *Boston Daily Globe*. In 1947 he went to *Time*, and was assigned as a reporter first to the Detroit Bureau, and then to the Chicago Bureau. Two and a half years after joining the company, he was transferred to Montreal, his present post. Mr. Conant's father, Dr. James Bryant Conant, is the former president of Harvard University, currently serving as U. S. High Commissioner to Germany.

GEORGES LANGLOIS (Interrogator)—Ottawa Parliamentary Correspondent for the newspaper *La Presse*, Montreal. Born at St. Johns, Quebec, he was educated at St. Johns and Montreal, graduating with a B.A. from the University of Montreal. He started to study law but gave this up in 1929 to become a full-time newspaperman with *La Presse*. In 1931 he left *La Presse* to become city editor of *Le Canada*, Montreal. Later he went to Paris to study at L'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales. While in Paris he wrote a book titled *Histoire de la Population Canadienne Francaise*. In 1933 Mr. Langlois returned to Canada and worked for *L'Ordre*, *Le Soleil* and *Le Canada* successively. In 1942 he assumed his present duties as Parliamentary Correspondent for *La Presse*. Mr. Langlois has covered many international conferences, delivered lectures, written articles for various publications, and done a number of radio commentaries.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 18

6. Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?
7. How Will a Change of Administration Affect Our World Position?
8. Do the Conventions Represent the Will of the People?
9. What Are the Real Campaign Issues?
10. Previewing the Democratic Convention.
11. Who Will Win in November?
12. What Changes Should There Be Within Our Political Parties?
13. Is the United States By-Passing the U.N.?
14. What Next in the Middle East?
15. How Can We Assure Integrity in Public Life?
16. Civil Rights and the Party Platforms.
17. America's Position in the Pacific.
19. Should We Back a Policy of Liberation or Containment?
20. Why Change?
21. Should the Taft-Hartley Act Be Repealed or Amended?
22. Is Today's Prosperity Real?
23. What are the Real Differences Between the Candidates?
24. Eisenhower Or Stevenson?
25. What May We Expect from Our New President?
26. Should the Communist Party be Outlawed?
27. What Is the Answer in Korea?
28. For Better Government: Mayor or City Manager?
29. Have We Weakened the True Meaning of Christmas?
30. What Are the Answers from Korea?
31. Has Creativeness in American Literature Declined?
32. Does Television Enrich American Home Life?
33. What Does Freedom of Speech Mean Today?
34. How Should We Fight Russia's "Hate America" Campaign?
35. Do We Overemphasize the Value Of Competition In America?
36. Should Congress Liberalize Our Foreign Trade Policy?
37. Can We Hold The Western Powers Together?
38. Which Way for A Better America?

Order single copies at 15c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 15c